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| But that is presumably just what the author wanted: a satirical “novel without a hero,” to quote the subtitle of Thackeray’s *Vanity Fair* that he loved to recall. Chiefly the trilogy registers the downside of industrial modernity evoked by Woodrow Wilson at the start of *The New Freedom* (1913), a depersonalization of social relations whereby person-to- person suddenly no longer seemed the defining model. *U.S.A.* rendered aesthetically the alienating effects of that socioeconomic shift far more cogently than did *The New Freedom,* a conspectus of Wilson’s presiden- tial agenda hastily cobbled together after the election. Wilson falls back on the archaic mantra that what the nation needs in order to realize its balked promise is to remove the roadblocks imposed by vaguely defined big interests to the unleashing of the autonomous energies of smaller entrepreneurs, “the men who are on the make rather than the men who are already made.”28 *U.S.A.*’s counterthrust becomes clear when seen against the background of novelistic precursors that also deploy the template of the sociocultural cross-section as national microcosm or heterotopia: Cooper’s *The Pioneers,* Melville’s *Moby-Dick,* William Dean Howells’s *A Hazard of New Fortunes,* and Frank Norris’s *The Octo- pus.* All dramatize chapters of national development by gathering an assemblage of figures, more or less heterogeneous in background and interest, interacting within a bounded space as players in a socially symptomatic enterprise or struggle. In Cooper, the project is a frontier town in the making where people of very different ethnoracial and class backgrounds rub shoulders. In Melville, it is a signature industry of the national economy in its paleotechnic phase that puts the social microcosm represented by the literal confinement of the *Pequod*’s crew in the same interdependent boat. In Howells, it is a magazine venture that draws upon and almost founders as the result of the dissonant class, ethnic, regional, aesthetic, and ideological agendas that the various players bring with them to the nation’s cultural metropolis at a moment of acute labor unrest. In Norris, it is the clash of city-based railroad and finance versus land-based ranching interests, themselves complexly fis- sured, as to who will have what degree of control over real estate and agricultural production. In each case the principal contending parties epitomizing the history-defining moment are embodied actors who, sooner or later, confront each other face to face. | 但这大概正是作者想要的：引用萨克雷《名利场》(*Vanity Fair*)的副标题（作者本人也喜欢提起这个副标题），写一本含讽刺意味的“没有英雄的小说”。三部曲主要记录了工业现代性的负面影响，伍德罗·威尔逊(Woodrow Wilson)在《新自由》(*The New Freedom*, 1913)的开头触动了这一影响，这是一种社会关系的去人格化，人与人之间的关系突然不再是确定性的模式。与新自由相比，美国在美学上更能令人信服地呈现出这种社会经济转变所带来的疏离效应。威尔逊回落在古老的咒语,国家需要为了实现其拒绝承诺是移除路障由定义模糊的大利益自主能量的释放的小企业家,”上的男人而不是男人。“28。小说的前身也将社会文化的横截面作为国家的缩影或异类乌托邦:库珀的《拓荒者》(the拓荒者)、梅尔维尔的《白鲸》(mobi - dick)、威廉•迪恩•豪厄尔斯(William Dean Howells)的《新财富的风险》(A Hazard of New fortune)，以及弗兰克•诺里斯(Frank Norris)的《章鱼》(the Octopus)。所有关于国家发展的章节都通过聚集一群背景和兴趣或多或少有些异质的人物，在有限的空间内作为有社会症状的企业或斗争的参与者进行互动，从而戏剧化地展现了国家发展的各个章节。在库柏，这个项目是一个正在建设中的边疆小镇，不同种族和阶级背景的人在这里相互接触。在梅尔维尔，它是国民经济在古技术阶段的一个标志性产业，把以“裴廓德号”船员字面上被限制在同一条相互依赖的船上为代表的社会微观世界置于同一条船上。在豪厄尔斯，这是一本杂志的创刊，由于不同的参与者带着不和谐的阶级、种族、地域、审美和意识形态议程，在劳工剧烈动荡的时刻来到这个国家的文化大都市，这本杂志吸引了几乎所有的创刊者。在诺里斯，问题在于谁将在多大程度上控制房地产和农业生产，这是基于城市的铁路和金融与基于土地的牧场利益之间的冲突。在每一种情况下，代表决定性历史时刻的主要竞争党派都是具体的参与者，他们迟早会面对面地面对彼此。 |